

[President.]

In the motion that I have just now read out to the House there is no question of any event of recent occurrence. On the other hand it is a definite recommendation by the honourable member that something should be done. That certainly does not fulfil the provisions relating to adjournment motions. Therefore I rule it out of order.

The next motion is—

“I beg to move for the adjournment of the House to discuss a definite matter of urgent public importance, *viz.*, the recent amendment introduced by the Government in the Education Code prohibiting prayers in schools.”

So far as I can see, I think this motion fulfils the requisite condition relating to an adjournment motion. Does any honourable member object to it?

Rao Bahadur Dr. N. Kunjan Pillai : Sir, I object to it.

President : Objection having been taken, as many honourable members as are in favour of the motion being discussed on the floor of the House, will please rise in their places.

No member rose in his place.

President : No member having risen in his place leave is refused.

Mr. K. P. Nilakanta Pillai : May I know, Sir, who sent that motion?

President : Of course, the gentleman who has been holding the field. (*Laughter*). Mr. Narayana Aiyar, you wanted to say something.

Mr. G. Narayana Aiyar : Sir, I wanted to make some representation in regard to the questions that I sent. They reached this office on the 3rd of Karkatakam and the regular business of this meeting commences only from to-day although there was a meeting on the 7th. There was no further business than the speech of the Financial Secretary on that day. Then there was the notice to hold a session from the 8th forward. There was also a conditional notice. It reads as follows —

“I am directed by the President to inform you, that if the Agriculturists' Relief Bill is passed by the Sri Mulam Assembly, it will be taken up for consideration by the Council at its meeting to be held at 12 noon on the 22nd July 1936 and on the succeeding three days.”

But some how it so happened that the Bill could not be taken up. So, the regular business begins only from to-day forward.

The rule specifically says:

"A member who wishes to ask a question shall give notice in writing to the Secretary at least 12 clear days before the date fixed for the meeting at which he desires to put the question."

I desired to put the questions only to-day. As such the questions were in time. After getting the order that questions are rejected I sent in another letter requesting that in the light of rule 12, the order may be reconsidered. I regret to submit that I have not got a reply to that. So I request that a definite ruling may be passed now by the Chair. Further, under the rules questions have to be sent only 12 clear days before, the *actual meeting*.

President : The fact so far admitted appears to be that the session was summoned for the 22nd July. It did not take place on that day for particular reasons. The question which the honourable member now asks is whether this session of the Council can be taken to have commenced on the 22nd July although no business was transacted on that day. Conversely, if the session fixed for the 22nd July had proceeded to transact work, obviously this session would have been regarded as having commenced on the 22nd July. It was, therefore, an accident.

Mr. G. Narayana Aiyar : May I point out one fact? In this rule, the word used is *meeting* not *session*.

President : Therefore the 22nd July was the day of the meeting. However it was by a mere accident that the meeting which had been convened for the 22nd July could not take place. If it had taken place the honourable member would certainly not have been in order in continuing the same questions on the ground that the meeting did not begin on the 22nd July. I have considered that question very carefully at the time these questions were sent up. I think there is no other ruling to be given now than what has already been given.

REGULATIONS ASSENTED TO BY HIS HIGHNESS
THE MAHA RAJA.

Secretary to the Council : Sir, I beg to report that the Travancore Hindu Law of Inheritance (Amendment) Bill and the Travancore Mechanical Lighters' Excise duty Bill have received the assent of His Highness the Maha Raja.

STATEMENT LAID ON THE TABLE.

Rao Bahadur A. Rengaswami Aiyar : Under Rule 76 of the Travancore Legislative Rules, I beg to lay on the table the following statement of expenditure authorised by the Government under Section 32 of Regulation II of 1108.